

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

FRANCIE E. MOELLER, EDWARD MUEGGE,
 KATHERINE CORBETT, and CRAIG THOMAS
 YATES,

Plaintiffs,

v.

TACO BELL CORP.,

Defendant.

Case No. 02-cv-05849 PJH (NC)

**ORDER RE: DISCOVERY STATUS
 CONFERENCE**

Re: Docket No. 656

The Court held a discovery status conference on December 7, 2011. After considering the representations made by the parties at the conference, the Court orders the following:

(1) Plaintiffs' request to bifurcate discovery into certification-related discovery and damages-related discovery is DENIED.

(2) Plaintiffs must respond to Taco Bell's twenty-third set of interrogatories and twenty-second set of requests for production of documents with respect to twenty class members only. By December 14, 2011, Taco Bell must identify to Plaintiffs the twenty class members regarding whom it wishes to obtain interrogatory responses and documents. After Taco Bell submits its list to Plaintiffs, Taco Bell may not substitute or add class members to that list without leave of Court. No further written discovery is permitted without leave of Court.

(3) By February 15, 2012, Taco Bell may conduct up to 35 depositions of class members

1 in preparation for its briefing on class certification. Each deposition may not exceed 90 minutes
2 without leave of Court. The parties must follow the procedure for noticing depositions described
3 in the order issued by this Court on November 9, 2011. *See* Dkt. No. 647. If any party believes
4 that modifications to this procedure would be appropriate, that party must submit a written
5 request to the Court containing its proposed modifications and the basis for its request.

6 (4) Taco Bell's request to re-depose the named plaintiffs in preparation for its briefing on
7 class certification is DENIED.

8 (5) The Court will hold a telephonic discovery status conference on January 11, 2012, at
9 2:00 p.m. Lead counsel must participate in the conference.

10 (6) By March 16, 2012, Taco Bell may file its opposition to Plaintiffs' motion to amend
11 the class definition, Dkt. No. 646, and its reply in support of its motion for class decertification,
12 Dkt. No. 611.

13 (7) Plaintiffs may file their reply to Taco Bell's opposition to Plaintiff's motion to amend
14 the class definition by April 6, 2012.

15 Judge Hamilton will set hearing dates on the motions once they are fully briefed.

16 IT IS SO ORDERED.

17
18 DATED: December 7, 2011

19 
NATHANAEL M. COUSINS
United States Magistrate Judge